

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has returned a copy of the form PTO-1449 filed on March 28, 2006 in the present application. While the Examiner has initialed the listed PCT publication, he has failed to initial the listed English translation of the Chinese office action. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to initial this reference on the copy of the form PTO-1449 submitted herewith along with a Request for Return of Initialed Form PTO-1449 and to return a copy to the undersigned.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Mattes and Ishizaki '412. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As discussed previously, in the presently claimed pedestrian protection system, the sensors 3 as recited are mounted on a front bumper and are aligned in the longitudinal (horizontal) direction of the front bumper 2 to enable detection of a collision with a pedestrian, even if the collision involves both a pedestrian and one or more other objects such as a tree or another vehicle. More specifically, due to the longitudinal alignment of multiple sensors on the bumper, a collision with a pedestrian can be detected if the output signal S from any one of the sensors 3 indicates that such a collision occurred, even if the output signals from the other sensors indicates a collision with an obstacle or obstacles other than a pedestrian. Additional details regarding the sensor signals S are shown in FIGs. 5-7 and are discussed in the corresponding portions of the specification.

As discussed in the previous Response filed on April 27, 2006 and as noted by the Examiner in numbered paragraph 8 of the present office action, Mattes fails to disclose a

plurality of sensors mounted on a front bumper of the vehicle and aligned in the longitudinal direction of the bumper. The Examiner has attempted to cure this deficiency in Mattes by asserting that Ishizaki '412 suggests a vehicular sensor system that includes a plurality of bumper sensors mounted to a front bumper of a vehicle in a spaced relationship in a widthwise direction for detecting a frontal collision of a vehicle with an object. However, as shown in FIG. 3 and as discussed at col. 4, lines 35-42 of Ishizaki '412, outputs of adjacent ones of first, second and third deformation speed detectors must be combined by first and second adders 32A, 32B to obtain two signals that are compared to activate actuators 40, 40.

On the other hand, claim 1 recites *inter alia*:

means for determining whether an obstacle colliding with the vehicle is a pedestrian...

the determining means performs its determination based on the output signal from each one of the plurality of the load sensors or the pressure sensors...

As described in the specification at, for example, page 9, line 24 – page 10, line 20, each one of the plurality of load or pressure sensors is capable of determining whether an object with which the vehicle has collided is a pedestrian or other object. As the signal that is output from each of the plurality of sensors is individually used to determine the type of object colliding with the portion of the vehicle bumper corresponding to the sensor location, the system can accurately detect a collision with a pedestrian even when the vehicle hits multiple pedestrians or other objects at once. (Note: claim 2 recites a determination means in a manner similar to claim 1, except that the determination means performs its determination based on the output signal from each one of a plurality of displacement sensors.)

Ishizaki '412 is not capable of such a calculation, as the sensor output signals from the multiple bumper sensors 21A-21C are combined to activate the actuators 40, 40 as discussed


above. Mattes also requires the use of a combination of output signals from both sensors S1 and S2 for reasons discussed in the previous Response and as discussed in, for example, paragraph 18 thereof, and therefore also again fails to teach or suggest the claimed determining means as recited in claims 1 and 2. As the combination of Mattes and Ishizaki fails to teach or suggest means for determining whether an obstacle colliding with a vehicle is a pedestrian based on the output signal from *each one of* a plurality of sensors, the Examiner has again failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that his rejection of the claims under 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 7 and 10 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Mattes, Ishizaki '412 and Ishizaki '278. As each of these claims depends from either claim 1 or claim 2, these claims are allowable for at least the reasons given above for the allowability of claims 1 and 2 and in view of the remarks in the Response filed on April 27, 2006.

As all outstanding rejections have been addressed, this application is now in condition for allowance. A prompt Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Although no fees are believed to be due at this time, it is respectfully requested that any such fees be charged to Deposit Account 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Posz
Reg. No. 37,701

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive
Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 707-9110 (phone)
Customer No. 23400